9th November 1935]

Local Self-Government

Objections of the South Indian Railway Company to the construction of two road bridges in Malabar.

* 518 *Q.*—Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there was any objection from the South Indian Railway Company regarding the construction of two road bridges in Malabar where there are only ferries now; and

(*b*) what the orders are of the Government with respect to the objection of the South Indian Railway?

A.—The Government of India have been addressed in the matter and their orders are awaited.

Mrs. A. RUKMANI LAKSHMIPATHI:—"May I know, Sir, what objections the South Indian Railway have raised in the matter of construction of road bridges and what the opinion of the Local Government is?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The South Indian Railway have sent in their views in the matter of construction of bridges and they have been forwarded to the Government of India with the recommendations of the Provincial Board of Communications. This Government and the Provincial Board of Communications are in favour of the construction and I see no reason to believe that the recommendations of the Provincial Board of Communications would be turned down by the Government of India."

Mr. W. K. M. LANGLEY:—"May I know, Sir, if the Government are aware that the general opinion of all commercial bodies of Malabar and South Kanara is that the proposed bridges would not damage railway interests to the slightest extent?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I cannot give a straight answer to that question; but in the opinion of the Government these bridges are necessary in the public interest."

Mr. W. K. M. LANGLEY:—"Is the Government aware that the public of Malabar is greatly inconvenienced through the absence of these bridges?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I am aware and I have also a personal knowledge of these parts."

Protests against G.O. No. 4619, L. & M., dated the 20th October 1934, in re the revision of salaries of teachers employed under local boards.

* 519 *Q.*—Mr. M. S. SRESHTA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he had received any representations from the local bodies and teachers' unions requesting him to revise the scale of pay of teachers in the service of local bodies before he issued G.O. No. 4619, L. & M., dated 20th October 1934;

(b) if not, whether he had consulted these abovenamed bodies and the Director of Public Instruction before revising the scales of pay;

(c) if the answer to the above is in the affirmative, whether their opinion was in favour of the revision;

(d) since the introduction of G.O. No. 4619, L. & M., dated 20th October 1934, how many local bodies and teachers' unions have protested against this Government Order;

(e) since the introduction of this G.O. No. 4619, L. & M., dated 20th October 1934, how many bodies have interviewed the Minister and how many have sought interviews with him asking him to rescind this Government Order; what replies were given to each of them;

(f) why was the recognized principle of the Public Service to exclude old incumbents from the operation of the new scales of pay when they adversely affect them, not applied in the case of teachers in the service of the local bodies; and

(g) how many representations have been received by the Government requesting them to give the old incumbents the old scale of pay?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The Director of Public Instruction was consulted.

(c) The Director of Public Instruction was in favour of the revision.

(d) & (e) A large number of representations were received. No useful purpose is likely to be served by giving further details.

(f) The Government were agreeable to the grant of personal pay in all cases of real hardship and so they did not consider it necessary to exclude existing teachers from the operation of the Government Order. Attention of the hon. Member is also invited to the reply of the Hon. the Chief Minister to the adjournment motion on the subject on the 26th January 1935.

(g) The Government do not consider it necessary to collect the information.

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that as a result of the introduction of revised scales of pay, a larger percentage of the people employed under the local boards are drawing higher pay than they used to get, and that it is only a small percentage that are drawing less than what they used to do?"

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" I am not aware of any such thing."

Preference to Graduates in filling the posts of Assistant Panchayat Officers.

* 520 Q.—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) in how many District Boards Assistant Panchayat Officers have been appointed as ordered in G.O. No. 2216, L. & M., dated 11th June 1935;